

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

CHARLESTON

ROBERT BLAKE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 2:10-cv-01152

DAVID BALLARD, Warden,  
MARVIN PLUMLEY, Deputy Warden,  
and LARRY PROPST, Business Manager  
at Mount Olive,

Defendants.

PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff has filed a Complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (docket # 1). Plaintiff is currently an inmate at the Mount Olive Correctional Complex, serving a sentence for Sexual Assault in the First Degree. This matter is assigned to the Honorable Joseph R. Goodwin, Chief United States District Judge, and it is referred to the undersigned for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation for disposition, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B).

Plaintiff has filed six other civil actions in this court. Four of those have been voluntarily dismissed. In the instant Complaint, Plaintiff alleges that on or about September 22, 2010, the Warden, Deputy Warden and Business Manager sent out a memorandum stating that, after October 1, 2010, the prison will be eliminating indigent pay. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief in the

form of an Order by the court to stop the elimination of this payment program. (# 1 at 4-5).

#### **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court screens each case in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. On review, the court must dismiss the case if the complaint is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. In Bell Atlantic Corp v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007), the Supreme Court observed that a case should be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if, viewing the well-pleaded factual allegations in the complaint as true and in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, the complaint does not contain "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." While the complaint need not assert "detailed factual allegations," it must contain "more than labels and conclusions" or a "formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action." Id. at 555.

The Supreme Court further explained its holding in Twombly in Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 129 S. Ct. 1937 (2009), a civil rights case.

The Court wrote:

Two working principles underlie our decision in Twombly. First, the tenet that a court must accept as true all of the allegations contained in a complaint is inapplicable to legal conclusions. Threadbare recitals

of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice. [*Twombly*, 550 U.S.] at 555, 127 S. Ct. 1955 (Although for the purposes of a motion to dismiss we must take all of the factual allegations in the complaint as true, we "are not bound to accept as true a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation" (internal quotation marks omitted). Rule 8 . . . does not unlock the doors of discovery for a plaintiff armed with nothing more than conclusions. Second, only a complaint that states a plausible claim for relief survives a motion to dismiss. *Id.*, at 556. \* \* \*

In keeping with these principles a court considering a motion to dismiss can choose to begin by identifying pleadings that, because they are no more than conclusions, are not entitled to the assumption of truth. While legal conclusions can provide the framework of a complaint, they must be supported by factual allegations. When there are well-pleaded factual allegations, a court should assume their veracity and then determine whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement to relief.

129 S. Ct. at 1949-50.<sup>1</sup>

#### ANALYSIS

Plaintiff's allegations fail to meet the standard set by the Supreme Court in *Sandin v. Conner*, 515 U.S. 472 (1995). In that case, the Court held that liberty interests protected by the Due Process Clause "will be generally limited to freedom from restraint which, while not exceeding the sentence in such an unexpected manner as to give rise to protection by the Due Process Clause of its own force, nonetheless imposes atypical and significant

---

<sup>1</sup> Because service of process has not occurred, a motion to dismiss has not been filed in this case. Such a motion, filed pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), *Fed. R. Civ. P.*, asserts that the complaint fails "to state a claim upon which relief can be granted," which is the same standard set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

hardship on the inmate in relation to the ordinary incidents of prison life." Id. at 484 (internal citations omitted). Plaintiff's allegations suggest no hardship which is either atypical or significant. Plaintiff has no federal constitutional right to receive "indigent pay," and this court has no authority or control over such prison programs.

For these reasons, the undersigned proposes that the presiding District Judge **FIND** that Plaintiff's Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and is legally frivolous. Accordingly, it is respectfully **RECOMMENDED** that the presiding District Judge **DISMISS** Plaintiff's Complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A with prejudice.

Plaintiff is notified that this "Proposed Findings and Recommendation" is hereby **FILED**, and a copy will be submitted to the Honorable Joseph R. Goodwin, Chief United States District Judge. Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1)(B), and Rules 6(d) and 72(b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff shall have fourteen days (filing of objections) and three days (mailing) from the date of filing this "Proposed Findings and Recommendation" within which to file with the Clerk of this Court, specific written objections, identifying the portions of the "Proposed Findings and Recommendation" to which objection is made, and the basis of such objection. Extension of this time period may be granted by the presiding District Judge for

good cause shown.

Failure to file written objections as set forth above shall constitute a waiver of de novo review by the District Court and a waiver of appellate review by the Circuit Court of Appeals. Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir. 1989); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984). Copies of such objections shall be provided to the presiding District Judge.

The Clerk is directed to file this "Proposed Findings and Recommendation" and to mail a copy of the same to Plaintiff.

October 1, 2010

Date

  
Mary E. Stanley  
United States Magistrate Judge